

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

This action is in response to remarks and amendments filed March 9, 2011. No claims were canceled, amended, or newly added. Accordingly, claims 1-48 are under current examination.

Withdrawn Rejections

The rejection of claims 1 and 5-18 over claims 1, 6-11, 41, 42, and 49 of copending Application No. 10/578,282 has been withdrawn and re-presented in view of the claim amendments in the copending application.

Maintained Grounds of Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronning et al. (US 4,683,132) in view of Martens, et al. (GB 2,039,740) and Harden (US 4, 512,933).

Ronning et al. teach compositions, devices, and methods for the extended control of insect activity wherein an insect control agent is adhered to a fiber having a rough surface which preferably is comprised of cellulose or cellulose derivatives. Further, Ronning et al. teach this invention with regard to efficacy against insects which are defined as "crawling and/or flying pests such as wasps, hornets..., house flies, mosquitoes, cockroaches..." (column 1, line 16). Additionally, Ronning et al. teach a pyrethroid active agent as the insecticide of choice (column 12, line 51). Although Ronning et al. teach the basic concept for insect control that is instantly disclosed, some of the limitations of the instantly claimed packaging means are not expressly included.

However, Martens, et al. teach several of the features of the instantly claimed packaging means. More specifically, instant claim 1 is drawn to a packaging means comprising a holder and a substrate wherein the holder comprises a top, a base, and a longitudinal member between the top and the base; this packaging means renders obvious the "longitudinal member vertically extending from between the top and the base thereby supporting the top and the base in a spaced-apart relationship" as recited in claim 1. Further, the instant invention includes this substrate which is attached to the top and the base and includes a honeycomb configuration as well as an effective amount of surface area in order to release an effective amount of the vapor active pyrethroid. Generally, Martens, et al. teach a vapor dispensing device for dispensing air fresheners, insecticides, and other air-treating vapors. The dispensing device of Martens shows an upstanding enclosure having dispensing openings and "characterized in that the enclosure is formed out of flexible sheet stock and including two upstanding opposed primary walls each defining dispensing openings and a structural carrier disposed within the enclosure to provide reinforcing dimensional stability between the primary walls, the structural carrier defining air flow channels from one of the primary walls to the other, and releasably holding the vaporizable composition" (page 1, column 2, line 109). Martens et al. expressly suggests that "a great variety of other shapes and arrangements of materials may be used to form the structural meansConvoluted rolls of corrugated cardboard, honeycomb configurations, cris-cross configurations...are a few examples," (page 4, column 1, line 19). Additionally, Martens et al. teach that control of vapor release is possible by

increasing or decreasing the carrier structure surface area which is exposed to air (page 4, column 2, line 89).

The Ronning and Martens references do not specify that the top is adjacent to the base when the holder is in the closed state or that the longitudinal member is "extendible" relative to the top and the base, as recited in amended claim 1. However, Harden teaches an apparatus for dispensing volatile substances; this apparatus comprises a frame to house a detachable and mountable replaceable substrate cartridge containing a volatile substance. As to claim 1, Harden includes a teaching of the state of the art in which a hinge connects an inner and outer shell by pivoting motion on the axis between the closed and open positions. In the closed position, the inner shell and outer shells together define an enclosed space, while the open position exposes the components (i.e., room deodorizers, insecticides) of the apparatus (see column 1, lines 13-15 and lines 51-56).

Ronning, Martens, and Harden are all directed to the distribution of vapor active compounds. Thus, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a hinge feature as taught by Harden for distribution of the active agents as taught by Ronning et al. and in the devices of Martens et al. One would have been motivated to do so to provide shielding of the active agent as well as controlled exposure of the active agent, as suggested in the Harden reference, which the ordinary artisan would have recognized establishes the state of the art with respect to systems for providing air currents that contact vaporizable products for distribution into the air. Additionally, due to the interrelated nature of a

vapor-active composition and its packaging means for delivery, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine features of the compositions, devices, and methods for controlling insects as taught by Ronning, et al. with features of the vapor dispensing devices of Martens et al. and Harden. Furthermore, the implementation of the cellulosic substrate as the carrier structure remains obvious due to the benefits of the improved stability and longer lasting properties of the cellulose counterpart to the paperboard precedent which Martens et al. teach. In view of these prior teachings, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found the combination of these known features as discussed above to have been *prima facie* obvious.

In regard to claim 2, which is drawn to the cellulosic substrate previously claimed and further limits this substrate to one which comprises two or more discrete parts, Martens et al. previously teach an analogous composition and packaging means which fulfill this limitation. Specifically, Martens et al. teach a carrier structure which includes one or more pieces substantially perpendicular to a reference plan midway between the two primary walls and having edges which are in contact with the primary walls. Clearly, the embodiment taught here comprises a substrate analogous to the cellulosic substrate of the instant invention as well as a general packaging means that, besides the analogous substrate difference, otherwise meets the limitations of the instantly claimed subject matter as well as the limitations of the claim on which claim 2 depends. And, finally, the embodiment which Martens et al. teaches clearly includes two or more discrete parts, any of those named above which may be chosen and isolated as a

discrete part.

In regard to claim 3, Martens et al. teach a container which releasably holds the vaporizable composition (page 5, column 1, line 35).

Claim 4 limits the packaging means to one in which the two parts are of substantially identical dimensions. Likewise, Martens, et al. teach a device where a carrier structure contains inside enclosures (page 2, column 2, line 100), and, as illustrated the structure and enclosure components, taken as two representative parts of the packaging means, clearly are of substantially identical dimensions as necessary to produce the desired fit and stability of the claimed packaging means.

Due to the aforementioned known successes related to the packaging means structure, contents, and control release functions, of analogous vaporizable compositions, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to implement the features of claims 1-4, 23, and 24 into the packaging means for emanating pyrethroid active agents as disclosed in the instant invention. For this reason, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found these implementations to have been *prima facie* obvious in view of the teachings of Ronning et al. and Martens et al.

Claim 41 is drawn to the lack of detachable nature of the top or bottom sides from the longitudinal member in order to replace the substrate. Likewise, Harden teaches a frame which is adapted to detachably mount a replaceable substrate cartridge containing a volatile substance (column 8, line 54) and where no deconstruction of the frame appears to be required in order to replace the substrate

cartridge. Similarly, claim 42 is drawn to the removability for replacement of the substrate component of the packaging device claimed. Where the top and base are in a closed position, as suggested by the instant claim, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would find the removal and subsequent insertion of the substrate component to be *prima facie* obvious in view of the prior art as applied to claim 41, since the common feature of these two claims is the limitation of detachability. Likewise, the stability of the instantly claimed packaging means as claimed assumes the capability storing the longitudinal member when the top and base are in a closed position, thereby rendering the content of claim 43 *prima facie* obvious as the content relates to the functionality and utility of the claimed packaging means.

Claims 19-21, 26-33, 39, 44, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronning et al. (US 4,683,132) in view of Martens, et al. (GB 2,039,740) and Harden (US 4,512,933) as applied above, and further in view of Thornton et al. (US 3,790,081).

Ronning et al. teach compositions, devices, and methods for the extended control of insect activity wherein an insect control agent is adhered to a fiber having a rough surface which preferably is comprised of cellulose or cellulose derivatives. Generally, Martens, et al. teach a vapor dispensing device for dispensing air fresheners, insecticides, and other air-treating vapors. The structure of the dispensing device which Martens, et al. teach precedes that of the instant invention and teaches an upstanding enclosure having dispensing openings. Thornton et al. add to the teachings of Ronning

et al. and Martens et al. by implementing structural device features.

Thornton et al. teach a device for dispensing a vaporizing composition to the surrounding atmosphere characterized by a hollow tubular body with end members sealing the open ends and apertures through the end members, a porous core member impregnated with a vaporizing composition, having a multiplicity of passages defined through the core member communicating between the end members and having end surfaces displaced from the end members, and a mounting means to maintain the device.

Claims 19-21 are drawn to the releasable attachment of the longitudinal member with respect to the top, the base, and the top and base, respectively. Although neither Thornton et al. nor the instant claim underscore the benefits of this releasability feature, Thornton et al. describe a device which has a core member communicating between each end member and "having end surfaces displaced from said end members" (column 6, line 67). In the context of this disclosure, Thornton et al. clearly describe a device which is in accordance with the limitations of the instant claims.

Claim 26 is drawn to the packaging means in which the longitudinal member is a column which vertically extends between the top and the base. Likewise, Thornton et al. claim a tubular body comprising the inner and outer device members (column 7, line 39).

Claim 27 is drawn to the packaging means in which the column can be folded at one or more hinged joints. Likewise, Thornton et al. claim components with apertures in which each end can be adjustably closed "by relative axial movement of

said telescoping members," (column 8, line 4). Clearly, the content of the invention of Thornton et al. is describing a hinging capability which is the same inventive concept of the instant invention.

Likewise, claim 28 is drawn to the column component of the packaging means which is collapsible by telescopic movement of one or more parts of the column within the other parts of the column. Again, Thornton et al. claim components with apertures in which each end can be adjustably closed "by relative axial movement of said telescoping members," (column 8, line 4). Clearly, the content of the invention of Thornton et al. is describing a hinging capability in which the hinge activity takes place within the other parts of the center piece, in the same or obviously similar fashion as that described in the instant claim.

Claim 29 limits the packaging means to one in which the column is comprised of two or more interfitting parts. In the same way, Martens, et al. teach a carrier structure, which is analogous to the instantly claimed column, which is formed of "two slotted, interlocked pieces" (page 4, column 1, line 4).

Claim 30 limits the column component to one which is comprised of two or more releasable interfitting parts. Likewise, Martens, et al. teach a carrier structure, which is analogous to the instantly claimed column, which is formed of "two slotted, interlocked pieces" (page 4, column 1, line 4).

Claim 31 limits the column component to one which is comprised of two or more non-releasable interfitting parts. Likewise, Thornton et al. teach a vapor dispensing device characterized by a hollow tubular body, which is analogous to the instantly

Art Unit: 1617

claimed column, which has end members sealing the ends and thus limiting the releasability of the interfitting parts (column 6, line 61).

Claim 32 is drawn to a packaging means in which the parts can be interfitted via a slotted configuration and where each part can fit into the slot of another one or more parts. Martens et al. teach the carrier structure with two slotted interlocked pieces (page 4, column 1, line 4) while the carrier structure also has edges which would engage primary walls (page 4, column 1, line 7). Clearly, Martens et al. previously had taught a device which contained interfitted parts which also fit into additional slots, as necessitated by the instant claim.

Claim 33 is drawn to a sliding adaptation capability where sliding between the column and holder is facilitated. Similarly, Thornton et al. teach "bottom edge of tubular body member blocks off apertures by means of a snug sliding fit between body and end member," (column 4, line 31). Regarding a comparison to the instantly claimed matter, the tubular body member taught by Thornton et al. is analogous to the column as instantly claimed, and the end member taught by Thornton et al. remains analogous to the holder as instantly claimed.

Where claim 39 is drawn to the containment of the substrate between the top and the base and where the substrate receives the longitudinal member through an aperture. Likewise, Thornton et al. teaches a device with a hollow tubular body with end members sealing the open ends and apertures through the end members, a core member containing a vaporizing composition, where the device has a multiplicity of passages through the core member. Evidently, the inventive concept which Thornton et

al. teach precedes that of the instant claim, thereby rendering it obvious.

Claim 44 is drawn to a rim implement to retain the vapor active pyrethroid when the top and base are in the closed state. Similarly, Thornton et al. teach a device wherein at least one of the end members is slidably sealed to said body and has apertures positioned to be adjustably closed by relative axial movement of said end member and said body (column 7, line 21). The concept which Thornton et al. claims here remains identical to that of the instant claim, therefore the concept which Thornton et al. claims precedes the instant invention, and due to the similar device functions and applications, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to utilize this sealing feature in order to maintain the integrity of the device.

Claim 45 is drawn to a lid implement to retain the vapor active pyrethroid when the top and base are in the closed state, a feature which Ronning, et al. and Martens, et al. do not focus on in their respective disclosures. Similarly, Thornton et al. teach a device wherein at least one of the end members is sealed via a sliding feature wherein the seal is to said body and has apertures positioned to be adjustably closed by relative axial movement of said end member and said body (column 7, line 21). The concept which Thornton et al. claims here remains identical to that of the claim 44. Harden summarizes the prior art as teaching a supply container supported directly on a reservoir lid and comprising a structure which cooperates with the housing to facilitate the disbursement of the active agent. Therefore the concept which Harden claims precedes the instant invention, and due to the similar device functions and applications, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to

utilize this cap feature in order to maintain the supply of the pyrethroid active agent until disbursement is desired. In view of the prior successes with sealed containers of the active ingredient, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found the instantly claimed lid feature to have been *prima facie* obvious.

Although Thornton et al. teach a vapor dispensing device which is not limited to the dispensing of pyrethroid compounds or even of insecticides, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been able to correlate the features of the deodorizing vapor dispensing device which Thornton et al. disclose and the features beneficial to an insecticide vapor dispensing device as disclosed in the instant claims. On account of this motivation, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found the utilization of the known features associated with these claims as discussed above to have been *prima facie* obvious in view of the prior art which teaches structural features of a vapor dispensing device as discussed above.

Claims 22-24, 37, 38, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronning et al. (US 4,683,132) in view of Martens et al. (GB 2,039,740) and Harden (US 4, 512,933) as applied above, and further in view of Spector (US 4,523,870).

The teachings of Ronning and Martens are delineated above. Spector elaborates on the teachings of Ronning et al. and Martens et al. by implementing structural device details, such as a control feature not detailed by Ronning et al. or Martens et al.

Spector discloses an aroma dispensing cartridge and holder assembly attachable to an air vent. The assembly is constituted by a holder provided with an array of parallel slots and a replaceable cartridge which is telescoped therein. The cartridge contains a porous pad impregnated with scent and includes a further array of slots. The inserted cartridge is axially shiftable relative to the holder from an inactive position in which the holder and cartridge slots are out of registration to effectively seal the pad, to an active position in which the slots lie in registration, as a consequence of which the forced stream from the vent passes through the pad in order to volatilize and diffuse the liquid active agent. Due to the detailed features which Spector teaches and which Ronning et al. and Martens, et al. do not elaborate on, one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the details which Ronning, et al. and Martens, et al. omit with the details on which Spector elaborates in order to construct an obvious improvement of the vapor dispensing device.

Regarding claim 22, which is drawn to the packaging means having a first and second position such that the top and base are in an open state in the first position or closed in the second position, a structural positioning feature which Ronning et al. and Martens, et al. did not expressly detail, Spector previously taught this inventive concept of a device implementing an open/closed feature in order to control the release of the contained composition.

Claim 23 is drawn to a packaging means in which the open state releases the active composition. Similarly, Martens, et al. teach an open condition in which the openings are aligned and product dispensing is facilitated (page 3, column 2, line 115).

Claim 24 is drawn to a packaging means in which the closed state contains the active composition. Similarly, Martens et al. teach a closed condition of the dispenser (page 3, column 2, line 112).

Due to the similar nature of dispersing an active agent through the medium of air, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the active/inactive position feature taught by Spector into the on/off feature claimed in the instant invention. For this reason, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found the implementation of the previously known "switch" feature to have been *prima facie* obvious in view of the teachings of Spector and Martens, et al..

Claim 37 is drawn to the combination of a holder and a substrate wherein the content of the substrate is retained in the holder until released or replaced; Claim 38 limits the holder to one comprising slots into which the substrate can be implemented. Spector teaches an aroma dispensing cartridge and holder assembly where the cartridge contains a porous pad impregnated with liquid scent and includes a further array of slots from which the pad can be replaced as desired. Further, this porous pad is analogous to the instantly claimed substrate. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that pads or substrates onto which volatile or active agents were loaded were commonly comprised in a container, holder, or other housing, where a variety of container types can be used. Further, all these container types include some means by which the container may be sealed to effectively store/preserve the volatile compound until such time as opened/activated by the consumer. So, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been aware of this feature allowing the user of a packaging device to

release the contents of the device at his or her will, and, consequently would have found the content of instant claims 37 and 38 to have been *prima facie* obvious.

Claim 40 is drawn to the removal and reattachment of the top or base in order to replace the substrate. Spector suggests that the components of the holder frame need to be partially detached from their functional position in order to replace the dispensing cartridge. So, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would recognize that the detachable feature as previously taught could be used in concert with the body of the instantly disclosed invention. Consequently, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized this feature as one which was *prima facie* obvious.

Claims 25 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronning et al. (US 4,683,132)in view of Martens, et al. (GB 2,039,740) and Harden (US 4, 512,933) as applied above, and further in view of Furner et al. (US 6,569,387).

The teachings of Ronning and Martens are delineated above. Furner et al. elaborate on the teachings of Ronning et al. and Martens et al. by implementing structural device details, such as features of a spray dispensing element that relate to and precede those of the instant invention.

Furner et al. teach a dual function dispenser which dispenses spray or an evaporative long term dispersible material. Additionally disclosed are refill units for these dispensers, and associated spray means remain advantageous with regard to this particular invention over the prior art as the consumer is allowed improved flexibility and

choice. The controlled functionality of a device which offers such control is not taught by Ronning et al. or Martens, et al.; so, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine this controlled functionality of an on/off switch feature with dispensing devices such as those which Ronning, et al. and Martens, et al. do teach.

Claim 25 is drawn to the aforementioned packaging means in which the top and base are capable of being maintained in an intermediate state which is between the open and closed positions.

The dual function dispenser which Furner et al. teach is one which employs a spray control button having not only open and closed positions, but also an interim position. That is, upon depression of the spray control button, the spray container dispenses product in an amount up to a calibrated volume, after which depression of the spray control button no longer dispenses product in order to waste less product and improve efficiency of the controlled dosage spraying (column 8, line 29).

Similarly, claims 34-36 are drawn to a spring which comprises the longitudinal member between the top and the base. Furner et al. do not expressly teach a spring as a dispenser, although one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the similarities between the function of the spray control button and spray control nozzle which Furner et al. teach and the spring controlling feature of instant claim 34. Claim 35 limits the role of the spring in the compressed state to one associated with the state of the packaging means being without an externally applied force. Similarly, Furner et al. teach the equivalent of this instantly claimed resting state; for example, the spray

control button which Furner et al. teach has a spray nozzle orifice which is aligned with the valve stem of the spray container, and the shell interlocks with the base by means of a latch opening. Upon use, as the valve stem aligns with the base latch opening, a stop means is implemented to prevent the consumer from attempting the push the base and the refill unit too far into the holder. The function and apparatus of the features which Furner et al. disclose here remain analogous to those instantly disclosed, thereby rendering the content of instant claim 35 to lack patentability over the prior art. Similarly, claim 36 shares this common control feature with the prior art. Due to these known control release valve features as disclosed by Furner et al. one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to implement a spring feature in order to continue the success of controlling product dispensing; for these reasons, this implementation would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claim 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronning et al. (US 4,683,132)in view of Martens, et al. (GB 2,039,740) and Harden (US 4, 512,933) as applied above, and further in view of Meetze, Jr (US 4,063,664).

The teachings of Ronning and Martens are delineated above. Meetze, Jr. elaborate on the teachings of Ronning et al. and Martens et al. by implementing the indicator feature which relates to and precedes this feature as claimed in the instant invention.

Claim 46 limits the packaging means to one which comprises an end-of-life indicator of a specified composition, while claim 47 limits the packaging means to one in which the indicator display is a numeric or color graphic display.

Meetze, Jr. teaches a device for indicating when automatic periodic operation has emptied an aerosol container. Mechanically, the invention of Meetze, Jr. includes a feature which allows the number of valve operations to be counted as a function of product release. More specifically, an embodiment of the invention includes a counting mechanism which includes a housing unit as well as a ratchet spring and gear mounted for rotation on a shaft spanning the distance between upper and lower plates. Each time the spring is deflected by movement of a dispensing lever, the ratchet gear is rotated through an angle defined by one tooth. Therefore, when the container has been operated to its maximum capacity, the counter mechanism can be used to signal that the container is empty (column 5, line 3). However, Meetze, Jr. does not express that a display indicator is present in this embodiment.

Harden teaches an apparatus for dispensing volatile substances; this apparatus comprises a frame to house a detachable and mountable replaceable substrate cartridge containing a volatile substance. Further, Harden teaches an apparatus which can include an indicator means for giving a visual indication that the substrate has been depleted of its supply of volatile substance (column 2, line 53). Since the limitations of the instant claim, a numeric or colour graphic display, are representative visual indicators which preceded by the visual indicator which Harden teaches.

Due to the similar function of vapor delivery and the inclusion of indicator features in the prior art, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to implement this indicator feature into the vapor delivery device of the instant invention. Further, in view of the prior art, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found this implementation to have been *prima facie* obvious in view of the prior art.

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronning et al. (US 4,683,132) in view of Martens, et al. (GB 2,039,740) as applied to claims 1-4 above, and further in view of Hayes et al. (US 5,899,382).

The teachings of Ronning and Martens are delineated above. Hayes et al. elaborate on the teachings of Ronning et al. and Martens et al. by implementing structural device details such as a hook mounting feature which also precedes the content of the instant claim.

Hayes et al. teach a device for releasing a volatile substance into an environment where the release takes place in a controlled or metered manner. Further, a reservoir made of a substance-absorbent material which is impregnated with a volatile substance in its liquid phase is located in a cavity open at the front surface of a container body. Additionally, the device may be packaged with film such that a vapor barrier is formed in order to preserve or store the composition until the consumer opens or activates the package. Upon absorption of the composition, the composition is introduced to ambient air, volatilized, released, and dispersed throughout an environment (abstract).

Art Unit: 1617

Claim 48 is drawn to the attachment of a hook feature to be added to the packaging means device in order to facilitate surface mounting of the packaging device. More specifically, Hayes et al. teach a mounting feature co-existent with a fishhook-shaped clip for securing the device on the area of a wood-type panel (column 6, line 40). Due to the various structural and functional similarities between the teaching of Hayes et al. and the instant invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to implement the successful feature which is the hook feature into a similar composition and delivery device. Given the particularly specific hook precedent which Hayes et al. demonstrate, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found the hook feature of the instant invention to have been *prima facie obvious*.

*Maintained Grounds of Rejection
over the amended claims of co-pending Application No. 10/578,282*

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Omum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory

double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 and 5-18 provisionally are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 58 and 60 of copending Application No. 10/578282 (Balakrishnan et al., 'copending') in view of Martens, et al. (GB 2,039,740) and Harden (US 4, 512,933). Delineated above are the teachings of Martens and Harden as they relate to the disperser apparatus of pending claim 1.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both inventions are drawn to a cellulosic based substrate or matrix for controlling flying insects. Further, the specific features of this cellulosic based substrate or matrix are directly related to the same invention as addressed below and in regard to claims 1 and 5-18.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the copending claims have not in fact been patented.

The body of the instant invention is drawn to a packaging means for retaining and releasing at least one vapor active pyrethroid composition where the container comprises a holder and a cellulosic substrate, among other structural and functional limitations. The features of instant claims 5-11 are included in copending Application No. 11578282 in claim 1 where the determination of the height limitations of each of instant claims 5-8 are presumed obvious in view of the intended function of the

Art Unit: 1617

packaging means. Claim 60 of the copending application outlines a cellulosic based substrate or matrix for controlling flying insects in which the cellulosic based substrate or matrix has a surface area in the range of 50-5000 cm². The inventive concept of the composition of the cellulosic based substrate which is a component of the packaging means of the instant invention remains the feature of the copending application. The copending application further limits the composition by necessitating the inclusion of a carrier solvent, particular pyrethroid agents rather than the general class of pyrethroids claimed in the instant invention, as well as temperature and dispersal rate limitations.

Claims 9-11 of the instant invention are drawn to the grams per meter of the cellulosic substrate, whereby these exact quantitative limitations would have been subject to routine optimization, depending on how much of the cellulosic substrate was deemed desirable and optimally effective in the total packaging product, a determination which would have been within the skill of the ordinary artisan particularly based on the conditions outlined in copending claim 60. Claims 12-18 of the instant invention are drawn to the quantitative amount o vapor active pyrethroid presence in the cellulosic based substrate per unit area, which is disclosed in copending claim 60 in a similarly obvious manner.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the above features in order to create a cellulosic material containing a pyrethroid active ingredient according to the claims addressed. Furthermore, one reasonably would expect success from such a combination of

features as those indicated from the comparison of the instant invention and the copending application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments presented 3/9/2011 have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicant's positions against cited references are summarized and responded to as follows.

Applicant asserts that the passages cited in Harden are not referring to Harden's disclosure but, rather, are referring to the Sullivan reference (see bottom of page 4 of 10 of Remarks). In reply, it is maintained that it is, in fact, the disclosure of Harden which has been cited (please see the statement of rejection on page 3 of the non-final Office action mailed 10/12/2010 as well as the specific citation in the Harden reference of column 1, lines 13-15 and lines 51-56. It is further noted that the "Sullivan" reference has not been cited or made of record in an 892 form, rather, the Harden reference has been cited. It is maintained that the aforementioned section of Harden is established for defining the state of the art with respect to the shape of an apparatus for administering volatile active agents (see Harden, column 1, lines 13-15 and also lines 34-36). As to Applicant's subsequent conclusion that "Sullivan fails to teach or suggest an alleged top that is adjacent to an alleged base when the device is in the closed position as alleged by the Patent Office" (page 6 of 10 of Remarks, first paragraph, last sentence), this conclusion is immaterial since this Sullivan reference has not even been made of record.

Applicant further asserts that "nowhere in Harden is it disclosed that a top is adjacent to a base when the device is in a closed state or that a longitudinal member is "extendible" relative to the top and the base as alleged by the Patent Office" (see page 6 of 10, paragraph 2, last sentence). In reply, it is maintained that the instantly recited shape was known in the art. Harden teaches that the apparatus for inducing air flow past a product being capable of being vaporized includes "a compact housing that comprises a hollow outer shell and a hollow, generally cylindrical inner shell, having an axis, on which the operating components of the apparatus are supported. The inner shell is mounted within the outer shell by a hinge to pivot substantially on the axis between closed and open positions..." (see column 1, lines 50-61). Based on this

shape and structure disclosed by Harden to have been known in the art at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill reasonably would have expected success from replicating or even modifying this structure so as to assure greater and more even product distribution as taught by Harden (column 1, lines 34-36) to have been known to be desirable for dispensing of volatile substances (see abstract, in particular).

Applicant incorrectly asserts that "the Office Action is completely silent with respect to the claimed feature 'wherein the cellulosic substrate has a honeycomb configuration..."' (see page 6 of 10, fourth paragraph). In reply, it is noted that this feature was addressed on page 4 (last line) of the non-final Office action mailed 10/12/10 as maintained herein.

Applicant asserts that that the secondary references Thornton, Spector, Furner, Meetze, and Hayes do not cure the alleged deficiencies of the Ronning, Martens, and Hardens references, the combination of which was addressed above (see page 8 of 10, second paragraph). In reply, this position is not persuasive since the Ronning, Martens, and Hardens references are maintained as addressed above to establish a case of *prima facie* obviousness. Further, this position is not persuasive so no arguments against the relevance of the Thornton, Spector, Furner, Meetze, and Hayes references have been presented.

Applicant's arguments against the provisional double patenting rejection of claims 1 and 5-18 over claims 1, 6-11, 41, 42, and 49 of copending Application No. 10/578,282 are unpersuasive over the amended claims of the copending Application, as further detailed above.

Conclusion

No claims are found allowable.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AUDREA BUCKLEY whose telephone number is (571)270-1336. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fereydoun Sajjadi can be reached on (571) 272-3311. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/AJB/

/Richard Schnizer/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1635